



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1.D
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,198	07/19/2001	Louis Stoll	10378/4	9731
21171	7590	06/29/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP JIM LIVINGSTON SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/909,198	STOLL, LOUIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 12-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 12-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on April 12, 2006. Claim 20 has been added by virtue of the amendment.
2. Claims 12-20 are currently pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding claim 12, the Applicant argues that the Cited Prior art (CPA), Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,322), does not teach "periodically validating access based on contractual relationship information." This argument is not found persuasive. Wood discloses an architecture wherein trust levels are established commensurate with certain resources. Based on what trust level requirements an application has, an existing login credential can be used, or a new login credential must be created which meets the trust level requirement (column 5 lines 46-57). This trust level mapping is viewed as a "contractual relationship" as the trust level establishes rules governing which applications the user can access with the credentials that were generated at that trust level. Furthermore, the "contractual relationship" is not between a trust level and the user, but it is between the user and the security architecture which allows access to

certain resources based on the contract (credential) which presents the user with a trust level. Therefore, it is asserted that a “contractual relationship” does exist in the CPA.

Furthermore, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “validating” access privileges, but instead teaches “authenticating” login credentials. This is not found persuasive. The login credentials are analogous to the access privileges as they provide a trust level, which provides conditional access to certain resources based on the trust level of the login credentials. Furthermore, based on www.dictionary.com, the terms “validate” and “authenticate” are synonyms, and therefore, are found to provide the same functionality.

Furthermore, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “periodic” validation. This argument is not found persuasive. The CPA teaches the session credentials and the underlying login credentials are periodically validated for such reasons as the temporal validity of the session credential and the login credentials (column 8 lines 44-67). Specifically, the CPA states the “underlying login credentials will be reauthenticated prior to the expiration of the session credential” (column 8 lines 55-58). Based on the above definition of validate and authenticate, it can be seen that the credentials are periodically validated based on the expiration time of the credentials.

Furthermore, regarding newly added claim 20, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “comparing user login data with contractual information between at least two parties to determine system access privileges.” This argument is not found persuasive. Wood discloses an architecture wherein trust levels are established commensurate with certain resources. Based on what trust level requirement an

application has, an existing login credential can be used, or a new login credential must be created which meets the trust level requirement (column 5 lines 46-57). This trust level to user mapping is viewed as a “contractual information” as the trust level establishes rules which govern which applications the user can access with the credentials that were generated at that trust level. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that Wood does teach “comparing user login data with contractual information between at least two parties to determine system access privileges.”

Finally, regarding newly added claim 20, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach “creating or deleting login data based on said comparing.” This argument is not found persuasive. Wood teaches that session credentials and the underlying login credentials are periodically validated for reasons such as temporal validity of the session credential (column 8 lines 44-67). If the login credential remains valid, a replacement session credential is issued, and if not, the login credential and the session credential are deleted (column 8 lines 57-67). The login credentials may be subject to being re-authenticated if the trust level mappings have changed (column 8 line 57 column 9 line 6). Therefore, it is asserted that the CPA does teach “deleting login data or creating login data according to said validating.”

Therefore, the rejections for claims 12-19 are maintained, and the CPA is applied to reject newly added claim 20 as described below.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322).

Regarding claim 12, Wood discloses:

A method for updating privileges for access to an information system, comprising:
periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information (column 5 lines 46-57); and
deleting login data or creating login data according to said validating (column 6 lines 57-67, column 8 line 44 – column 9 line 6).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes matching a login data item to the contractual relationship information (column 6 lines 44-56).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein the contractual relationship information is included within an eligibility database (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating access privileges includes updating a datapage (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes cross-referencing eligibility information with security information (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes matching business rules to user login information (column 6 lines 1-9).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information wherein said access privileges define at least one or a program type, data item type, feature type, and menu option type (column 5 lines 46-57, column 6 lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 19, Wood discloses:

A method for updating privileges for access to an information system, comprising:
periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information (column 5 lines 46-57);
creating login data independent of an attempt to access information in the system (column 6 lines 57-67, column 8 line 44 – column 9 line 6).

Regarding claim 20, Wood discloses:

A method for updating privileges for access to an information system, comprising:
comparing user login data with contractual information between at least two parties to determine system access privileges (column 5 lines 46-57); and
creating or deleting login data based on said comparing (column 8 lines 44-67).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KA
06/24/2006


Ayaz SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100